F7 cond.

MICHIGAN

SUITE

ROAD,

š

3001

entered in the game-interactive information screen; wherein, extrinsic factor data is entered in the pre-game information screen to record extrinsic factors having an effect on a player's performance, and the post-game report is further based on extrinsic factor data to display the effect of extrinsic factors on the player's performance.—

## Remarks

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, and 6-38 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first and second paragraphs, based on 1) an objection to the specification concerning the phrase "generally-writable display", and 2) a number of antecedent basis objections outlined on pages 3 and 4 of the Office Action.

Applicant has replaced the "generally-writable display" language in the specification with "general output display". This is believed to overcome the Examiner's objection. Applicant submits that the previous "generally-writable display" language was sufficient to enable one of ordinary skill in the art to understand it as meaning capable of having almost anything displayed on it in any format, i.e., a "general output" display. Applicant never intended the original language to mean a device that reads handwritten input pressed onto the display itself.

Applicant has additionally made the amendments suggested on pages 3 and 4 of the Office Action, to the best of his

ability, in order to traverse the second basis for the rejection under \$112.

Applicant has amended the dependency of claim 17; specifically, it should have originally depended from claim 10, and has now been rewritten as an independent claim including the limitations of claim 10.

Claims 11, 16-18 and 21 have all been rewritten as independent claims including the limitations of their base claim, claim 10. Claim 10, which is the only claim for which there is an outstanding rejection based on the prior art, accordingly now stands alone; there are no claims dependent on it.

Applicant has included a phrase similar to "including screen-dependent data input fields to the golf play information on each screen", where appropriate, in independent claims 1, 10, 15, 19, 23 and 33, as recommended by the Examiner.

SUITE

3

3001

BASILE,

As suggested by the Examiner, applicant has repeated the amendment previously made to the specification at page 14, line 11, this time correctly requesting entry at page 14, line 26.

The foregoing amendments are believed to overcome all of the objections and rejections under 35 U.S.C. \$112 regarding both the specification and claims.

The Examiner has rejected claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. \$103 in view of Barber. The Examiner has correctly noted that

Barber does not disclose any pre-game information screens which define the parameters of the game to be played. However, applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's position that:

(e)

MICH

₹.

"It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine a pre-game screen such as an initializing screen with Barber's method in order to make it easier for record keeping or tallying purposes by recording in the device the number of players and the player names who will play a round of golf."

Applicant's claimed pre-game information screen in claim 10 is not a mere "initializing screen," but one which "prompt[s] entry of data which defines parameters of a game to be played". A mere "initializing screen" used "for record keeping or tallying purposes by recording...the number of players and the player names" is not the same as the "parameters of the game to be played", which applicant's invention defines before the game so that the player can later correlate performance to certain parameters and prepare himself in the future when those same parameters arise again.

However, to further distinguish applicant's claimed step of "displaying in sequential fashion one or more pre-game information screens...", applicant has amended claim 10 to recite the preferred relationship between the pre-game information screen setup and the game-interactive screens by reciting the additional step that "choosing one of the game-interactive recording information screens determines the number of pre-game information screens displayed in sequential

fashion". This is a feature of the parameter-defining pregame screens not found in Barber, and not suggested by the Examiner's argument. It is supported in the specification, for example, at page 9, lines 20-24. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 10 is believed to be traversed.

Applicant has added a new independent claim 40, similar to claim 10 but including the limitation of entering extrinsic factor data in a pre-game information screen to record extrinsic factors having an effect on player performance. Claim 40 is therefore believed to be allowable over Barber and the art of record.

Applicant has added new independent claim 39, similar to claim 33 and therefore believed to be allowable for the reasons cited for the allowability of claim 33 on page 7 of Paper No. 18. Claim 39 differs from claim 33 in that it does not include the "selection" step in connection with the recording of extrinsic factor data and player performance data.

SUITE

W. BIG

3001

YOUNG

There do not appear to be any outstanding objections to the drawings at this point. Applicant accordingly requests that he be allowed to defer submission of the formal drawings until receipt of a notice of allowability. Applicant has submitted the drawings of record to a draftsman to prepare the formal drawings, and they should be ready by the time a notice of allowability is received. The undersigned spoke with Examiner Sager on August 3, 1996, and permission to defer the

formal drawings was granted.

Applicant now believes this application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any questions concerning this response or the amendments, he is invited to contact applicant's undersigned attorney at (313) 662-0270.

Respectfully submitted,

Jason J. Young Reg. No. 34,048

LAW OFFICES YOUNG & BASILE, P.C., 3001 W. BIG BEAVER ROAD, SUITE 624,